arXiv:math/9204207v1 [math.LO] 15 Apr 1992

ON GÖDEL'S SECOND INCOMPLETENESS THEOREM

Thomas Jech

Gödel's Second Incompleteness Theorem states that no sufficiently strong consistent mathematical theory can prove its own consistency. In [1] this is proved for every axiomatic theory extending the Peano Arithmetic. For axiomatic set theory a simpler proof was given in [2] using the fact that in set theory, consistency of a set of axioms is equivalent to the existence of a model.

In this note we give a very simple proof of Gödel's Theorem for set theory:

Theorem. *It is unprovable in set theory (unless it is inconsistent) that there exists a model of set theory.*

By "set theory" we mean any axiomatic set theory with finitely many axioms. The proof (suitably modified) works for any theory sufficiently strong to formulate the concepts "model", "satisfies" and "isomorphic", such as second order arithmetic and its weaker versions.

If M and N are models of set theory (henceforth *models*), we define

$$M < N \text{ if there exists some } M' \in N \text{ isomorhic to } M.$$

If $M < N$ and if $M' \in N$ is isomorphic to M then for every sentence σ,

$$M \models \sigma \quad \text{if and only if} \quad N \models (M' \models \sigma). \tag{1}$$

It follows that

$$\text{if } M_1 < M_2 \text{ and } M_2 < M_3 \text{ then } M_1 < M_3. \tag{2}$$

Supported in part by NSF grant DMS–8918299

Typeset by $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{M}}\mathcal{S}$-TEX

Let us consider some fixed coding of formulas by numbers (Gödel numbering), and let S_n be the name for the nth definable set of numbers.

Definition. S is the set of all numbers n with the property that for every model M there is a model $N < M$ such that $N \models n \notin S_n$.

Let k be the Gödel number of S. The following sentence is provable in set theory:

$$k \in S_k \leftrightarrow \forall M\, \exists N < M\, N \models (k \notin S_k).$$

Therefore (by (1) and (2)), if M is any model then

$$M \models (k \in S_k) \leftrightarrow \forall M_1 < M\, \exists M_2 < M_1\, M_2 \models (k \notin S_k). \tag{3}$$

We shall now assume that it is provable that there is a model, and prove a contradiction. As a consequence of the assumption, we have not only

$$\text{there exists a model} \tag{4}$$

but also (using (1))

$$\text{for every model } M \text{ there exists a model } N < M. \tag{5}$$

Toward a contradiction, we assume first that $k \in S$. Let M_1 be an arbitrary model (by (4)); there exists an $M_2 < M_1$ that satisfies $k \notin S_k$. By (3) there exists an $M_3 < M_2$ such that for every $M_4 < M_3$, $M_4 \models k \in S_k$. Therefore $k \notin S$, a contradiction.

Thus assume that $k \notin S$. There is an M_1 such that for every $M_2 < M_1$, $M_2 \models k \in S_k$. Let M_2 be an arbitrary model $< M_1$ (it exists by (5)). As $M_2 \models k \in S_k$, we have (by (3))

$$\forall M_3 < M_2\, \exists M_4 < M_3\, M_4 \models (k \notin S_k).$$

Let $M_3 < M_2$ (by (5)) and let $M_4 < M_3$ be such that $M_4 \models k \notin S_k$. As $M_4 < M_1$ (by (2)), we have a contradiction.

References

1. Kurt Gödel, *Über formal unentscheidbare Sätze der Principia mathematica und verwandter Systeme I*, Monatsh. Math. Phys. **38** (1931 pages 173–198).
2. Petr Vopěnka, *A new proof of the Gödel's result on non-provability of consistency*, Bull. Acad. Polon. sci. math. **14** (1966 pages 111–116).

Department of Mathematics, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA 16802

E-mail address: jech@math.psu.edu